REMARKS

Claim 1 is the single independent claim originally examined in amended form. Claims 2-16 depend therefrom. Claim 25 is new and is independent. New claim 26 depends from claim 25. Thus, there are currently presented two independent claims 1 and 25 with the remaining claims depending therefrom.

Claim rejections

Claims 1, 6, 10, 11 and 14 were rejected as anticipated by Daiguji et al., U.S. Patent 4,557,007. The Daiguji reference was also relied upon with respect to subsequently articulated claim rejections alone and in combination, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103. However, in view of the arguments presented in this response, it is believed that both the anticipation and the obviousness rejections are overcome.

Briefly, the invention relates to a civil engineering structure designed to attach a cable comprised in multiple strands to an anchor point associated with a suspension bridge or other cable supported structure. The construction includes multiple strands defining the cable. The strands are attached to an anchoring device. A collar or other means for deviation is provided at a distance spaced from the anchoring device to maintain the strands in a bundle having a peripheral shape. The collar, or means for deviation, maintains the strands in a bundle which is more compact than maintained at the anchoring devices. The strands thus diverge from that compact bundle as they approach the anchoring device or converge as they approach the compact bundle.

The invention is a combination and relates to the inclusion, intermediate the anchoring device and the collar or means for deviation, of a guide member. The guide member

incorporates various claimed features. It generally comprises a tubular arrangement through which the strands of the cable are directed. The inner surface of the tubular member s adapted to the peripheral shape of the bundle of strands. Perhaps most importantly, the inner surface forms a convex curvature over the length of the guide member, which allows angled deflections of the strands that are greater than the maximum angle of convergence of the strands between the anchoring device and the collar. The inner surface thus, does not necessarily provide a bearing, or support surface, for the strands. It includes, as depicted in Figure 2, a configuration or shape, which allows deviation or movement of the strands, or reinforcement members. The amount of deviation is defined as being greater than the maximum angle of convergence of the strands between the anchoring member and the collar. This is all clearly indicated in Figure 2, wherein the guide member 30 is depicted as having a surface which is convex in shape, extending generally from one end of the guide member 30, toward the opposite end. This arrangement enables movement of the strands of the cable, particularly for example, in seismic events, in a manner which will avoid or at least diminish the adverse impact of such events upon the stresses placed on the cables. Thus, over the length of that guide member, the convex curvature allows angular deflections of the reinforcements, or strands, up to an angle greater than the maximum angle of convergence of those reinforcements, between the anchoring device and the collar. The language of the claims, which becomes relevant in this context, is that which calls for the guide member to "allow" the "deflections".

As mentioned previously, the patent to Daiguji, et al., is not believed to encompass a teaching of the claimed subject matter of the present application. Specifically, Daiguji et al. discloses cable strands, or wires 19. These wires 19 are encased or encompassed within

concrete. (See column 1, lines 53 and 54 and column 2, lines14-20). The convergent pathway of the wires 19 is guided and fixed by ribs 16 and 16′. It is to be noted that the wires 19 rest on the ribs, 16 and 16′. It is further noted that the ribs 16 and 16′, based on a review of the drawing and the specification, thus support the wires 19. There is no allowance for deflection of those wires 19 in response to seismic events or other events. This would follow, since the wires are encased in concrete and supported on the ribs 16 and 16′.

Further the ribs 16 and 16′, do not have a convex curvature. There is clearly no statement that their outer faces are convex. The drawing appears to indicate that those faces are straight lines. Even assuming they are convex, there is no teaching that over the width of those ribs, that there is a construction which allows angular deflection of the wires, or reinforcements. The ribs 16 and 16′ merely support the wires 19 and fix or limit deflection. They do not allow deflection from a convergent pathway. The ribs 16 and 16′ actually define the angular deflect on of the strands or wires 19. They limit the amount of deflection, but they do not comprise a convex curvature that allows deflections larger than the maximum angle of convergence as claimed. The ribs 16 and 16′ merely establish the angle of convergence and they do not allow additional deflection.

For the aforesaid reasons therefore, it is believed that the reference to Daiguji et al. is not apt. Similarly, none of the other references teach the inclusion of a guide member, as claimed, having the structural and functional features as set forth in independent claim 1 and newly submitted is dependant claim 25. It is noted that newly submitted claim 25, reference is made to the cable comprised of strands and to a collar in combination with an anchoring device. Utilization of the words "collar, strands and cable" is not meant to comprise a limitation or a

restriction under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Equivalent structures, mechanisms or devices for collars and strands are considered within the scope of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: December 27, 2005

By: _____
Jon O. Nelson
Reg. No. 24,566